

Appln. No. 10/058,602
Amendment dated January 5, 2003
Reply to Office Action mailed October 3, 2003

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 16 remain in this application. Claims 17 through 20 have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn. Claims 21 through 25 have been added.

The present Amendment attends to some minor antecedent basis inconsistencies and awkward grammatical phrasing in the claims that are not thought to affect the patentability of the application.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

Paragraphs 1 through 4 of the Office Action

The election of claims 1 through 16 is hereby affirmed.

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action

The drawings have been objected to.

Submitted with this Amendment are replacement sheets with formalized drawings of Figures 1 through 6 of the application. It is submitted that these formalized drawings correct any confusion regarding reference numbers "16" and "18". Reference numbers "78", "80" and "68", which are not mentioned in the specification, have been omitted from the drawings.

In light of the proposed drawing amendment, it is therefore submitted that the objection to the drawings as originally filed has been overcome, and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Appln. No. 10/058,602

Amendment dated January 5, 2003

Reply to Office Action mailed October 3, 2003

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action

The abstract has been objected to for the informalities noted in the Office Action.

The abstract has been amended in a manner believed to clarify any informalities in the language, particularly at the points identified in the Office Action.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Office Action

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 (second paragraph) as being indefinite.

The above amendments to the claims are believed to clarify the requirements of the rejected claims, especially the particular points identified in the Office Action.

Withdrawal of the §112 rejection of claim 1 is therefore respectfully requested.

Paragraphs 9 and 10 of the Office Action

Claims 2 through 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kritske in view of Larson or King. (It appears that this rejection was also intended to apply to claims 7 through 9, 12 through 14, and 16.)

Claim 2, particularly as amended, requires "at least one sheet support removably mountable on a lower portion of the carriage and positionable along the carriage for supporting a lower edge of a sheet good positioned on the carriage". This feature of the invention permits the adjustable positioning of the sheet support on the carriage for supporting a lower edge of a sheet good, especially when the face of the sheet good is rested on or

against the carriage. As the actual location of the cutting operation on the sheet goods will vary, the ability to easily move and reposition the sheet support on the carriage is significant, so that the sheet support may be moved away from the location of the cut if necessary.

It is submitted that the patents relied upon in the rejection of the Office Action would not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the requirements of claim 2, especially the requirements set forth above. The Kritske, Larson, and King patents fail to teach a sheet support that is removably mountable and positionable on a carriage for supporting a lower edge of a sheet good.

Also, claim 5 as amended requires "wherein each of the supports includes at least one connector joined to the upper upright, each of the connectors being capable of removably receiving a portion of an elongate member extending in a substantially horizontal orientation between respective connectors of the supports", and it is submitted that the cited patents do not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to an apparatus including this feature in combination with the features of claim 2.

Further, added claim 24 requires that "the carriage includes a support surface against which a face of a sheet good is restable, and wherein a portion of the at least one sheet support extends substantially perpendicular to the support surface of the carriage". It is also submitted that the patents cited in the Office Action do not suggest this feature in combination with the features set forth in claim 2.

Additionally, added claim 25 requires that "at least a pair of the sheet supports are removably mountable on the carriage, positions of the sheet supports being adjustable on the carriage independently of each other". Again, it is submitted that the patents relied upon in the rejections do not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to a combination of this feature and the

Appln. No. 10/058,602
Amendment dated January 5, 2003
Reply to Office Action mailed October 3, 2003

features set forth in claim 2.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 2 through 6 is therefore respectfully requested.

Paragraph 11 of the Office Action

Claim 1 has amended in a manner submitted to overcome the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in paragraph 8 of the Office Action, and as indicated in paragraph 11 of the Office Action, claim 1 is submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Paragraph 12 of the Office Action

Paragraph 12 of the Office Action states that claims 10 through 11 and 15 would be allowable if written into independent form with the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Added claim 21 incorporates the limitations of claims 2, 6, 9, and 10 (in their as-filed form), and therefore claim 21 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 22, by virtue of its dependency from added claim 21, is also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Added claim 23 incorporates the limitations of claims 2, 12, 14, and 15 (in their as-filed form), and therefore claim 23 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Appln. No. 10/058,602

Amendment dated January 5, 2003

Reply to Office Action mailed October 3, 2003

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KAARDAL & LEONARD, L.L.P.

By 

Date: 1/5/04

Ivar M. Kaardal (Reg. No. 29,812)

KAARDAL & LEONARD, L.L.P.

3500 South First Avenue Circle, Suite 250

Sioux Falls, SD 57105-5802

(605)336-9446 FAX (605)336-1931

e-mail patent@kaardal.com